

Published at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.  
Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.  
DAILY, Per Month.....\$3 00  
DAILY, Per Year.....36 00  
SUNDAY, Per Year.....6 00  
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year.....42 00  
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month.....3 50  
Postage to foreign countries added.  
All checks, money orders, etc., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President of the Association, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street; Treasurer of the Association, M. F. Laffan, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, D. W. Quinn, 170 Nassau street.

London office, 11, Abchurch Lane, 11, Abchurch Lane, Strand. The daily and Sunday Sun are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, Cannon street, Regent street, and the Steamship Agency, 17 Green street, Leicester Square.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 77, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opera, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

John Raines.

The death of JOHN RAINES removes the most conspicuous and the most commanding figure of the State Legislature, and a man who, more than any present day politician, embodied the strength and the weakness of that old school of politics and politicians which so long dominated the party councils and the public life of this State. Whatever there was of accuracy in the phrase "the old guard," so often heard at Albany, belonged to the description of RAINES and the party ideas which he served.

RAINES' domination of the State Legislature, his unquestioned mastery of its machinery, was due neither to accident nor to undeserved good fortune. Whatsoever else may be said of JOHN RAINES, the one unquestioned fact is that from the hour he succeeded to the leadership of the majority party in the Senate until his death no man successfully challenged his authority or waged successful contest against his control. In debate, in caucus, in party council, his advice and his suggestion were equally powerful, because they were reckoned wisest by his party associates.

With the recent growth of independence in public life JOHN RAINES had neither patience nor sympathy. An independent Republican was to him a thing hateful beyond all else. Against every step toward the loosening of machine control and partisan solidarity he fought persistently and with the full measure of his strength. In the days of his political apprenticeship he obeyed the party authority, to question the direction of the party never occurred to him. It was a thing outside his political conception, and when in later years he encountered it it roused every passion of hate and bitterness.

The fight that JOHN RAINES fought to the end of his life was an unpopular one. It brought upon him the popular distrust and resentment which was the natural consequence of a changed public ideal of party politics. From the consequences of his course, however, he never sought to escape. A fighter always, he accepted his responsibility, took the full burden of popular disfavor, and fought doggedly on. From his public career there was always lacking those qualities of public service that win admiration and command permanent gratitude. An ideal legislator, a wholly admirable public servant, JOHN RAINES never was; his notion of public service itself precluded this.

For a decade, however, Senator JOHN RAINES was the strongest man in the State Legislature. Men obeyed him not with reluctance, but willingly, acknowledging his right to leadership. His knowledge of State affairs and State issues was as well recognized within legislative halls as it was overlooked outside. Nor can it be denied that the men who served under his leadership acquired and retained for him a feeling of respect and of affection out of proportion to the popular notion of his character. Loyalty he inspired even among those who differed most widely from him in questions at issue.

In a remarkable degree JOHN RAINES embodied an ideal of public and party life that is passing. His fight was always doomed to ultimate defeat, and always bound to fail to awaken the public applause which even a losing fight frequently receives. His death at this time doubtless saved him from much humiliation, but it also obscures the popular vision of those qualities which gave him his power and explained his influence.

It will surprise few familiar with the Albany situation if the cause and the political ideals for which he fought vanish with him. In a very peculiar degree, JOHN RAINES was not merely of the "old guard," but the "old guard" itself.

#### Paternalism.

In a lecture at Princeton on "Present Day Legislation," a part of which is printed in this morning's SUN, Mayor McCLELLAN traces the origins of American political philosophy, its embodiment in the fundamental law, and the legislation and the tendencies in public life and popular opinion that have risen therefrom. We find it rather refreshing, though the "Jeffersonians" may stare and gasp to read of a certain felicitous:

"Jeffersonism was a political platform of half baked and glittering generalities intended to catch votes."  
As such, at least, "Jeffersonism" or "Jeffersonianism" is immortal. It is the soul, if they have any, of most politicians. Well, "individualism" dwindled; "collectivism," the worship of the all doing and all meddling Government, State,

municipal and Federal, grew like JACK'S beanstalk, only that went heavenward, while paternalism takes the direction of Colonel HENRY WATKINSON'S favorite dog. Will individualism ever reassert itself, even moderately? The pocket nerve will wince, Mayor McCLELLAN thinks:

"The seed of destruction latent in collectivism is the enormous cost to the taxpayers involved in the practical application of the doctrine."  
The seed of destruction, yes; but is it collectivism that will be destroyed? Who else is so meek as the American taxpayer? Whose occasional grumbles are so harmless? Nobody at Albany, Washington, New York, minds him. Still, it is well that the youth of JAMES MADISON'S college should be allowed to see the better way, whether they can be induced to follow it or not.

#### In Justice to Senator Lodge.

The impression has been disseminated, through a misapprehension, apparently, that the Hon. HENRY CAROL LODGE of Massachusetts, who is a historian, not a pundit in the law of nations, has indorsed the impassioned legal argument of the Hon. ISIDORE RAYNER in which he maintained that President ZELAYA of Nicaragua was amenable to the military if not the civil courts of the United States for murder. What Mr. LODGE did say in the Senate after Mr. RAYNER'S peroration was this:

"Mr. President, I have listened with great interest, as I know all others have, to the speech just made by the Senator from Maryland (Mr. RAYNER). I am very glad that the Senator from Maryland approves so strongly the attitude and the course of action taken by the Administration. I myself cordially and heartily approve it, and I am sure that it meets with general approval and support. I do not think any one will differ with him materially as to the character of ZELAYA, but the practical question which is presented is one of very great difficulty. How can we separate the criminal from the innocent country and people? I myself cordially and heartily approve it, and I am sure that it meets with general approval and support. I do not think any one will differ with him materially as to the character of ZELAYA, but the practical question which is presented is one of very great difficulty. How can we separate the criminal from the innocent country and people?"

If the words of Mr. LODGE are weighed it must be concluded that he is in doubt about the jurisdiction and the process claimed by Mr. RAYNER for the punishment of President ZELAYA. Mr. LODGE shares the eminent international lawyer's abhorrence of the Nicaraguan dictator, but to be on the safe side Senator LODGE asked that the remarkable resolution calling for the apprehension and trial of ZELAYA be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was so ordered. Thirteen heads are better than one. Mr. RAYNER is not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but he has intrepidly promised to produce his authorities.

#### The Newspaper Entente in War.

General J. FRANKLIN BELL doesn't so mean it, for he is one of the most kindly of men, but his remarks about the press in general sound like a slur on journalism. Any one can see that he is inspired by an honest desire to regulate newspaper reports in time of war so that no measures of strategy may be made public for the information of the enemy. He therefore suggests the cooperation of the newspapers to that end. Nevertheless, as it seems to us, the General's proposition reflects on the press and serves no other purpose.

Just how a correspondent can in time of actual war get hold of and publish any item that ought not to be published and thereby give light and guidance to the more or less dastard foe is a conundrum we do not pretend to solve. Naturally we make one reservation, though that could not possibly apply to any well disciplined army—the reservation that bars heart to heart confidences between the correspondents and the higher military officials. It might be supposed that a commanding officer engaged in a serious campaign would be in a much better position to enforce this limitation upon his own subordinates than upon newspaper employees, over whom he has no sort of control, yet General BELL seems to think that it is necessary to secure concert of action between the reporters and the army by means of an entente which will in effect release all military secrets without legally binding any one to their respectful preservation. It is possible that he proposes to establish a favored class and leave the others to their own devices. There, however, the difficulties are both numerous and formidable. The correspondents left to their imaginations would run riot in the domain of fancy. The correspondents burdened by such august confidences would be reduced to hopeless inefficiency, and no good would come of it in either event.

Take, for example, the war with Spain, meaning especially the operations around Santiago in 1898. Our newspapers were stuffed full of the wildest kind of gossip; not all of them, but most of them. Some that were naturally conservative and responsible kept within the bounds of reason and probability, but the others printed canards and fairy tales without restraint, to their own entire satisfaction and to the riotous gossamer of their constituents. Surely General BELL doesn't think that all this conveyed important and injurious information to the enemy. Supposing we had had an antagonist worth mentioning at that time, and he had consulted those extravagant, conflicting and flamboyant chronicles for guidance, he would within two weeks have been tenderly ensconced in a padded room picking straw out of his hair and asking to be addressed as the Velled Prophet of Khorasan.

One correspondent on July 1 charged the blockhouse at El Caney single handed after eight hours of engagement, found every Spaniard dead inside, and then informed General LAWTON'S army, six thousand strong, that it might approach without fear. We know this, for we saw it in a magazine, illustrated copiously. The question whether General J. FRANKLIN BELL, Chief of Staff,

expects to bridge correspondents of this class, and they are getting to be more abundant and more irresponsible every day, is of the deepest interest. We are not concerned in it, but we follow General BELL with wide eyed curiosity. Meanwhile the old plan seems to be the most easily utilized. There are many correspondents who can be trusted and many newspapers that can be depended on to preserve a confidence. Why shouldn't the army devote itself to these and leave the matter of a general entente to be decided in another and a better world?

#### The Aeroplane Motor.

In England a prize of \$5,000 has been offered for a twenty-four hour aeroplane motor. The engine must develop not less than thirty-five brake horsepower, and in weight not exceed 245 pounds. In making the award the following points will be considered: weight and petrol consumption, reliability and steadiness of running, wear of working parts, security against fire, air resistance offered by the motor. The conditions under which the tests are to be made will be regarded by inventors as severe, but the promoters of the competition maintain that to prove its usefulness for flight and transportation the aeroplane must do much better than keep the air for three hours; accordingly they make an entire day the desideratum. Mr. H. H. SUFFLEE in discussing the improvement of the aeroplane motor in *Cassier's Magazine* has said:

"For long distance flights, the fuel economy of the engine takes on an increasing importance over its gross weight, and the present tendency is to consider that the extreme lightness of some of the motors is not absolutely essential. Above all things, reliability is essential in a motor of aerial service, especially for aeroplanes, in which the operation of the engine is essential to the maintenance of the machine in the air. Although a properly constructed aeroplane will not fall, but will descend gradually if the motor stops, it is altogether possible that the machine may be over water, or above a densely wooded country, or in case of war, may be inconveniently close to the enemy, and the continuous operation of the motor thus becomes indispensable to the safety of the operator. For these and similar reasons it is now generally accepted that there is no further reason for attempts to attain greater lightness; but that maximum reliability, simplicity and a high degree of economy in fuel consumption are the ends to be secured."

Each motor entered for the competition in England will be tested "on a twenty-four hour run," and the total time of stoppage will be limited to thirty minutes, while the number of stops must not exceed three. Balancing will be taken into consideration, and the tests will take place in an air current of thirty miles an hour. Much fault has been found with this last condition. In some aeroplanes the engines are placed behind the propeller, which develops a draught or rush of wind greatly in excess of thirty miles; so that a motor might satisfy the condition and yet in actual air flight perform badly. Moreover, the natural velocity of the air must be added in such a case. Lubrication is a very important factor in a long motor run, and it is doubted whether a system of forced lubrication can be devised that will keep the machinery working smoothly.

The British technical journals are not sanguine about the success of the trials. Some of them think the standard set is too high. In other quarters there is scepticism about the worth of the tests, since it doesn't follow that if an engine is found to run for twenty-four hours the same results could be attained under the difficult and often complicated conditions of actual flight. The future of the aeroplane as a practicable ship depends upon continuity of the motor in operation, but aside from perfecting the mechanism the ability to carry adequate petrol is a most important consideration. Weight of the fuel must enter into calculations as well as weight of the engine. We hear much of potential achievement in the case of aeroplanes equipped with motors made in France, Germany and the United States, but if the inventors were frank they would admit that no long flights are yet possible. Doubtless more petrol could be carried, but the limit of the operation of the most successful motors now in use seems to be about three hours. Entries for the British competition close on April 30, 1910. As yet no time has been set for the trials. It is safe to say that if any inventor could produce a motor that would satisfy the conditions required, the \$5,000 prize offered by the promoters in England would not greatly interest him, although success in the competition would be an excellent advertisement of his engine.

Representative WILLIAM H. STAFFORD of Wisconsin, who has introduced a bill providing for the meeting of Congress on the second Monday in November hereafter, says in explanation of it:

"If we got down to business in November instead of December we would be able to accomplish a great deal more. As it is now, we meet just before the Christmas holidays, and the recess comes on before we are aware of it. Between the date of meeting in December and the date of reconvening after the holiday recess is usually a period of inactivity. Let us meet in November."

Is Mr. STAFFORD aware that Thanksgiving comes in November? He can have no assurance that members of Congress would not insist upon adjournment from November 21 to December 4 to celebrate the feast of turkey and fixings and mince pie. Then there would have to be another adjournment—the same old adjournment—of two weeks for the Christmas holidays. The double festivities would be terribly demoralizing. Even private pension might be neglected. Moreover, would members of Congress want to work another month for the present salary of \$7,500 a year? They would probably ask for an increase to \$10,000. The session begins early enough now for any Congress that is ordinarily punctual and industrious—and punctilious.

There is nothing surprising in the announcement that Major-General LEONARD WOOD will succeed Major-General J. FRANKLIN BELL as Chief of Staff on April 8, 1910. General WOOD has been the ranking officer of the army since General ARTHUR MACARTHUR retired in June. The latter was head of the army for a considerable time, and the rank of Lieutenant-General expired with him. If any officer may be called the "head of the army"—now it is the senior Major-General, and not the Chief of Staff, unless he happens to be the senior Major-General. The term of the Chief of Staff is four years. General BELL was appointed on April 6, 1906, and he has held the post with marked ability. We suppose that General LEONARD WOOD made an application for the detail, or it was offered to him as senior officer of the army. Judging from the ability and independence he has shown in his reports as a department commander, he will make a successful and energetic Chief of Staff, neither afraid of new ideas nor slow to assert himself. It may be predicted that he will have scant patience with red tape.

#### With extreme caution was the Prairie guided past the Fish Hawk Island.

With extreme caution was the Prairie guided past the Fish Hawk Island. With extreme caution was the Prairie guided past the Fish Hawk Island. With extreme caution was the Prairie guided past the Fish Hawk Island.

General, and not the Chief of Staff, unless he happens to be the senior Major-General. The term of the Chief of Staff is four years. General BELL was appointed on April 6, 1906, and he has held the post with marked ability. We suppose that General LEONARD WOOD made an application for the detail, or it was offered to him as senior officer of the army. Judging from the ability and independence he has shown in his reports as a department commander, he will make a successful and energetic Chief of Staff, neither afraid of new ideas nor slow to assert himself. It may be predicted that he will have scant patience with red tape.

With extreme caution was the Prairie guided past the Fish Hawk Island. With extreme caution was the Prairie guided past the Fish Hawk Island. With extreme caution was the Prairie guided past the Fish Hawk Island.

#### THE WAR OF 1812.

##### Until Jackson's Great Victory American Reverses Were the Rule.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: In letters to THE SUN recently on the subject of the war of 1812 many points of interest have been raised which will be much talked about when the hundredth anniversary of the war is celebrated.

It does not matter greatly what the war was about, what the results were, or anything else now, but those who are interested in history will be able to get some idea of the war from the account of the popular misconceptions concerning the conflict by reading "The Military Policy of the United States," compiled by the late Major-General Emory upon and left by him as a legacy to his country, and published by the War Department. The book is a masterpiece of the request of General W. T. Sherman, who "read and approved it." The accuracy of the statements made in it cannot therefore be impugned. I condense a few of them.

1812. When war was declared (June 18) the total of the British troops in Canada was less than 4,500 effective, mainly old men and invalids. The United States regular army, numbering on paper 34,000, was actually but 17,434 strong. In July General Dearborn was ordered to capture Lake Ontario. Without inflicting any damage he suddenly retreated to Detroit, where (August 16) he was besieged, and without firing a shot he surrendered the city and the British, numbering 1,300, including 600 Indians.

On October 10, 4,000 Kentucky mounted militia had marched against Indians on the Wabash across a prairie, a prairie fire broke out, and the militia fled in confusion, leaving 1,400 men. Without inflicting any damage he suddenly retreated to Detroit, where (August 16) he was besieged, and without firing a shot he surrendered the city and the British, numbering 1,300, including 600 Indians.

November 28 General Smyth, having landed 4,000 militia for a month, started to invade Canada, but returned the same afternoon. On December 19, General Dearborn, with 1,400 men, was defeated at the battle of the Clouds, and then went into winter quarters. Nearly all the militia refused to cross the line.

During the year 1812 United States troops, including 100,000 militia, accomplished nothing against 100 British.

1813. At Fort Meigs, where 1,200 Kentucky militia were sent to the support of General Harrison, the whole of them were routed, only 100 escaped.

May 27. At the successful repulse of the British at the battle of the River Raisin, 2,500 militia ran away after firing one volley.

At General Wilkinson's attack on Montreal, 1,000 militia fled in confusion, leaving 1,400 men. Without inflicting any damage he suddenly retreated to Detroit, where (August 16) he was besieged, and without firing a shot he surrendered the city and the British, numbering 1,300, including 600 Indians.

1814. During the year we could not, 34,000 militia, 17,434 strong. In July General Dearborn was ordered to capture Lake Ontario. Without inflicting any damage he suddenly retreated to Detroit, where (August 16) he was besieged, and without firing a shot he surrendered the city and the British, numbering 1,300, including 600 Indians.

1815. General Jackson's victory at New Orleans, 18,000 militia, 17,434 strong. In July General Dearborn was ordered to capture Lake Ontario. Without inflicting any damage he suddenly retreated to Detroit, where (August 16) he was besieged, and without firing a shot he surrendered the city and the British, numbering 1,300, including 600 Indians.

A great many erroneous ideas exist in regard to American success in the warfare of 1812. The majority of the people of this country who have been educated in American schools are under the impression that the war was on land and on sea a series of magnificent victories won by inexperienced militia against the British regulars.

The plain, unvarnished truth is that the campaign of 1812 was a series of humiliating disasters for the United States.

At the close of the war, Washington was taken and sacked, and this country was compelled to sue for peace and to accept it in a treaty which gave to the British the right to hunt and to take up arms was not even mentioned.

#### A Singular Way of "Working Up Trade" With Latin Americans.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: It is laughable to read the string of preposterous lies fabricated to breed prejudice in the United States against the people of Nicaragua. It is also regrettable to read the contemptuous and narrowminded comments by some newspapers of the country.

They reveal not only gross ignorance of the facts of the case, but also a lack of knowledge of its people, area and population.

A Cleveland daily, for instance, used the calumny of "These ignorant coffee colored slaves" to describe the people of Nicaragua. It is also regrettable to read the contemptuous and narrowminded comments by some newspapers of the country.

They reveal not only gross ignorance of the facts of the case, but also a lack of knowledge of its people, area and population.

A Cleveland daily, for instance, used the calumny of "These ignorant coffee colored slaves" to describe the people of Nicaragua. It is also regrettable to read the contemptuous and narrowminded comments by some newspapers of the country.

They reveal not only gross ignorance of the facts of the case, but also a lack of knowledge of its people, area and population.

A Cleveland daily, for instance, used the calumny of "These ignorant coffee colored slaves" to describe the people of Nicaragua. It is also regrettable to read the contemptuous and narrowminded comments by some newspapers of the country.

They reveal not only gross ignorance of the facts of the case, but also a lack of knowledge of its people, area and population.

A Cleveland daily, for instance, used the calumny of "These ignorant coffee colored slaves" to describe the people of Nicaragua. It is also regrettable to read the contemptuous and narrowminded comments by some newspapers of the country.

They reveal not only gross ignorance of the facts of the case, but also a lack of knowledge of its people, area and population.

#### THE WINTER ACADEMY.

##### First Notice.

The late Edward A. MacDowell once remarked to the present writer that the music of Tchaikovsky sounded better than it was. This witty criticism might be so transposed as to be applied to the Vanderbilt Gallery of the Winter Academy exhibition at the Fine Arts Building. There on the north wall are hung a dozen or more pictures, so harmoniously mingled and spaced that they really seem better than they are. The names of the members of the hanging committee are Elliott Daingerfield, F. G. R. Roth and J. Allen Weir. We regret that the conventions usual in such matters prevented them from including their own work.

Considered as a totality the Winter Academy falls short of last spring's function. It lacks snap and vigor. It is placid, though not dull. There is some brilliant painting and so many high keyed and clear colors that black and gray come as an optical relief. There are 271 contributions selected out of 1,200 submitted. Also there were 170 odd pictures related with apologies for lack of space; but they never will be missed. The fewer the pictures, the better any exhibition, and particularly at an Academy affair. As it is, there are too many mediocrities, and some of these mediocrities are actually represented by two or three canvases. Except in the case of John S. Sargent and a few others this is a reprehensible practice.

The aforesaid north wall contains some attractive art; some of it familiar. There is Lydia F. Emmett, for example. You would naturally suppose that this industrious lady could have no chance in company with such a portrait of Sargent, John W. Alexander, Irving Wilcox and the rest. On the contrary, she seems to have arisen to the occasion, and her portrait of Nora Leelin is one of the most dashing we have yet seen from her fluent and imitative brush; surely she knows the Sargent planes well, quite as well as John De Costa, for instance. Then your eye roves along to Sargent's "Gitanas," owned by George H. Hearn; solid, satisfying brushwork; rich, self-contained color. The modelling of the head is sufficiently explicit without being obvious—as is the head of Montague's "River," the portrait of his wife. Mr. Sargent does not resort to such abridgments as does Robert Henri in his very chic "Girl With Parasol." Lucidity is the keynote of this specimen—not peculiarly distinguished—from the Sargent studio.

Frederick Ballard Williams is honored by a pair of pictures, both in his accustomed key of lucid tones and Monticelli echoes. He is a romantic in landscape. Ben Foster's "Evening Mists" is discriminating in feeling and composition, but as obvious as Redfield's "Rising River" is not. Here sentimentality is wedded with decorative painting; there is freshness of vision, and, in point is not of the so-called "tonalists," either sticky or sensuous. A capital Redfield, indeed. President John W. Alexander's large canvas "Sunlight" is precisely where it ought to be, in the place of honor. Your interest is about evenly balanced between the decorative curves—you are tempted, at the risk of becoming unintelligible, to say alliterative curves—and the delightful opposition of tones. The tiny shafts of sunshine and the dappled yellow-green tones are handled with delicate grace, nay, Hellenic grace. The picture leaves you unexcited, however; but then, the chords of emotion are seldom swept by this artist.

Paul Dougherty's "Black Squall" is in his accustomed vein. It is sonorous, rhythmic, attention arresting; though we have had stronger meat from him. Like Emil Carlsen's, his seas are sometimes a trifle too decorative and self-conscious. Waugh strikes the sterner note. A charming decoration, "The Peacock," by the lamented Louis Loeb, proves that he was attaining mastery of his technical material and doubling down his own lived his predilection for fabulous flesh. The model is more vital than was the work with Loeb; you feel that she has a skeleton concealed within her nacreous flesh; the color too is without morbidity. "Caverns of the Deep," by De Witt Parrish, is as grim as a canto from the "Inferno." He appreciates the melodramatic suggestion of depths and vast rocks and obscurity. "Girl and Horse," by Irving Wiles, is not attractive. Which is the better, the girl or the horse? The horse, of course. Carlsen's Meeting of the Seas is shown last week. It is an excellent study apart from its irrelevance—in arrested movement. This about comprises the canvases on the famous wall, the canvases that look better than they are.

Following our nose, we come upon Elliott Daingerfield's "Pearls of the Morning," a graceful shallow imagining; a nude of vaporous bulk sitting on the edge of a pool in which float water flowers. Very pretty, Mr. Daingerfield; but Fantin-Latour turned the trick with more ease, throwing into his conception warmth and poetry. Gedney Bunce is very much in evidence, he has seldom shown to such advantage. Venice, or its vicinage, through a newly broken or rare poached egg, shattered, is as picturesque as ever. Charles H. Davis's "The Quarrier" neither titillates the imagination nor yet dulls it. Again, Miss Emmett bobs up, a double portrait of children, while Mr. De Costa's stately portrait of a lady inevitably suggests comparisons with his friend Sargent. We may pass the Smedley, though not the Ritchie midnight fishing subject, which is as loosely yet as vigorously presented as any I have seen. And signed almost James Preston, despite a certain lightness of touch, is rapidly reaching the heights, now deserted, where once the Eight of yesteryears made their abode. He has a color sense; perhaps the faculty of selection might be better developed.

Mr. Sargent's portrait of Miss Carter is of his accomplished performances, in which, suppressing at the outset any desire to psychologize, he detains your interest by the fluidity of his marvellous surfaces, by the facility, well high displayed, with which he renders fabrics, airy or concrete. Knowing that the subject could not endure dissection, he evades the fatuous smile of the posed society girl—but the truth is writ large enough—and seems to say: "Watch me make gorgeous cadenzas out of nothing! Presto!" Sargent is still the wizard, though he early waged his soul with the Belial of technique and lost it—and gained the other thing, but in such superabundance that the world hardly misses the soul. Walter Palmer's loe in the glen looks like loe cream, but new snow and loe often look so. "The Opalescent River," a prize winner by a newcomer, Gardner Symons, gave a jolt to the older men. Mr. Symons has been in Europe for three or four years. If he keeps up his present gain he will soon pass any of the men painting naturalistic landscapes. As it is, there are not half a dozen among them who can contrive such tonal beauty and rhythm. His pattern makes a picture. It is a thing sincerely seen and selected; the tonal transitions are subtle.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: It would be quite interesting if your correspondent Mr. James A. Jardine would add one more paragraph to his letter and tell us where the grace of God led him when he left "the Christian Church (orthodox)." OGDEN H. BOWEN, NEW YORK, December 16.

#### Reskin's Frosts From His Books.

From the *London Chronicle*. The profits made by Ruskin from his books were in the end very large and fully justified his belief in being practically his own publisher. In "For Claviger" he wrote: "I could even sell my books for not inconsiderable sums of money if I chose to bribe the reviewers, stick bills on the lamp-posts and say nothing but what would please the Bishop of Peterborough." Mr. George Allen, who published the book, told Mr. E. T. Cook that Ruskin's profits in 1886 were over £4,000, and that in addition he had increased a valuable stock. From one issue of "Modern Painters" he received £2,000. He had a practice of giving whole of his large private fortune in various forms of benevolence and enthusiasm, and during his later years his income was wholly derived from the sale of his books.

#### A Former Vestryman.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: It would be quite interesting if your correspondent Mr. James A. Jardine would add one more paragraph to his letter and tell us where the grace of God led him when he left "the Christian Church (orthodox)." OGDEN H. BOWEN, NEW YORK, December 16.

#### Suggestion to an Author.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: I would suggest to Mr. Joseph Pliska of Brooklyn that he read Jack London's "Martin Eden," and if he fails to be justified he can collect his money. PHILADELPHIA, December 15.

#### College Honors.

The Tiger-Princeton has Yale boys discovering.

Howard Gardner Cushing's portrait is his usual engaging, metropolitan, richly woven arabesque. It has a sumptuous appearance that makes you think of tapestry, but never of anything human.

Robert Van Boercker still paints his classic landscape, soothing, serene, and of an Old World vraisemblance; but it is too near for comfort to Frederick Waugh's "Green Deep," which is a elemental sweep and bulk. Waugh has a sense of the sea, like Walt Whitman; the sea, the "giddy 'scooper of graves'!" This great wet expanse comes rushing toward you, the skyline high up, alone, giving the needed relief. Petersen's "Berry Pickers," with its effect of dappled sunlight, is of interest; we wish we could say the same for Howard Russell Butler's "Summer and Seventeen." The "Louise" of Alphonse Jongers is not to be passed, for it is clever enough leaning heavily for its pattern on the "Miss Alexander" of Whistler and not avoiding points from Sargent. Bruce Crane's landscape is as excellent as it is unobscured.

Mr. Henri's wicked, skanky witch with the parasol has the fetching power we know so well; also his irritating mannerisms. The tact of omission as practiced by Manet Mr. Henri does not possess; nor has he the allure of Goya; nevertheless both these masters peep out in this picture. The silhouette of the head is almost empty; there are ominous spaces, not made plausible, and the eyes of the girl are glittering and beady; more beady than glittering. Still more disquieting is that wooden splinter which does duty as a right arm. To be sure, it is stabbed firmly into the girl's side, and at a distance of a mile or so falls into place; nevertheless it will offend the eye of the scrupulous surgeon. But the sparkling audacity, the insolence of pose, the general "go" of the composition—not too profound in intention—redeem its shortcomings. Mr. Henri's other portrait, that of Mrs. William Rockwell Clarke, in the south gallery (No. 57), is an admirable exemplar of his great skill and distinction of style. The blacks and grays, the brilliant flesh tones—too brilliant if the rules of reasonable modulation are cited—the judicious adjustment of tones, the vitality of expression, are very convincing, very seductive. Architectonic was never this painter's strongest virtue; its absence here is compensated to some degree by the unfailing vigor of the handling.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Will you kindly give space in your paper to some of the criticisms of Dr. William Allen made before the Women's Republican Club upon the work of the Interborough Association of Women Teachers and its efforts to establish the principle of equal pay for equal work? Dr. Allen would seem to infer that he is a disciple of modern research methods, and yet his sweeping statements are made without either reference or authority. Assertions are made concerning the value of his work, the reliability of his sources and the value of his conclusions. As the assertions stand in the newspaper reports Dr. Allen's statements are suspiciously free from any evidence of careful investigation.

First of all, Dr. Allen authorized to speak for Mr. John Purroy Mitchell? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Secondly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Thirdly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Fourthly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Fifthly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Sixthly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Seventhly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Eighthly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Ninthly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Tenthly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Eleventhly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.

Twelfthly, will Dr. Allen publish the results of his investigation? The 15,000 women teachers are anxious to know if Dr. Allen is to be the champion of the cause of the women teachers, or if he is to be the champion of the cause of the men teachers.